



INTERRELATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW WAY OF THINKING AND A CULTURE OF SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION IN MODERN CONDITIONS

Turabova S.

Associate Professor of Termez University of

Economics and Service, Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy (PhD),

E-mail: turobova.sevara@mail.ru

ORCID - 0000-0001-9028-6943

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
This article analyzes the functional aspects of scientific debate as an acceptable method for finding solutions to problems arising in the field of scientific knowledge and practical activity.	science, communication, problem, theory and practice, innovative thinking, truth debate, development, information, criticism, argument, knowledge, conflicting opinions, problematic situations.

INTRODUCTION

In the system of world philosophical researches, fundamental researches of constructive importance are developing on the logical-epistemic analysis of the integration of debate as a means of communication in the system of science and socio-political life. At a time when the decisive power of empirical analysis aimed at creating new knowledge for science is weakening in the field of current theoretical knowledge, and the priority of conducting thought experiments with ideal objects and mathematical models is increasing, falsification, discursiveness, which serves to clarify and develop the conceptual apparatus of science within the framework of scientific debate and tools such as rationalization are perfected. Therefore, in the current period, when the processes of differentiation and integration of sciences are accelerating, the functional-argumentative importance of the scientific debate as a logical-epistemic tool is increasing in the search for a solution to the problem of demarcation of scientific knowledge from non-scientific knowledge.

It should be recognized that it is not enough to correctly imagine the problem situation in order to find the correct solution to the problem. For this, it is important to foresee various methods and means of solving the problem. According to its logical character, scientific debate is the most organized and systematic form of truth-seeking communication. "Each perceived, learned fact means that new fields of action and opportunities for scientific and practical activity have been opened" [Panjiyev S. 2014, p. 144]

Debate is a very effective tool for creative research in times of serious problem situations in science, especially when complex and even dramatic problems arise in the field of science. It is in such a place that many alternative scientific hypotheses and theories usually arise, and as a result, knowledge takes on the appearance of a controversial process. In cases where it is not possible to get a clear answer immediately in the process of scientific knowledge through discussion, a research method is implemented in the form of creating models that can give a lot of answers to the question and passing them through approval. In the development of science in the form indicated above, the research function of the debate is realized. Therefore, the effectiveness of the debate is based on the fact that it is possible to approach the solution of the problem from different positions, on the maximum use of the scientific potential of many scientists, on the possibility of avoiding the absolutization or limitation of some points of view. The objectivity of debates is also determined by the existence of opposite characteristics and relations characteristic of the studied objects, events and processes. The conflicting features inherent in them from the beginning lead to the emergence of conflicting opinions, hypotheses, theories.

MATERIALS AND METHODSTHE

The causes of scientific debates are based on contradictions, paradoxes, and antinomies characteristic of scientific perception. Scientific debates are aimed at achieving various goals, in particular: clarifying and posing a problem, finding a solution, evaluating the proposed point of view, determining their level of truth, checking the evidence and logical correctness of thinking, discovering new aspects of the problem, etc. used for In the scientific debate, "the question of truth is inextricably linked with the problem of proof. This is especially well understood in science, in the effort to establish its scientific laws" [Sharipov M., 2016. 96 p.].

There should be no recourse to external authorities as arguments in genuine scientific debates, and there should be no place for demagoguery, labeling, sophistical trappings, or other forms of intellectual fraud. The driving force of scientific debate is proof and refutation, which reflects and unites the opposition of the proposed point of view. It will be possible to solve the problem by using them effectively.

The constructiveness and effectiveness of debates is achieved on the basis of certain methodological principles. Among these principles are the principle of the plurality of elements of the discussion (it applies not only to the presented theses, but also to the points of view, approaches, methods, preliminary assumptions), as well as the principle of criticality (the right of each participant to critically analyze and justify the rejection of the proposed opinions) contains.

Necessary conditions for a successful discussion include the fact that the concepts and terms used in the discussion are used in the same sense according to their content in order for the participants to understand each other. Also, in order to achieve the goals set in the discussion, the following rules can be added:

- first, to put the question correctly and clearly define the subject of the discussion;
- secondly, to be aware of the essence of the discussed problem, to clearly and clearly express the opinions being advanced;
- thirdly, not to allow the thesis to be replaced by the situation;
- fourth, to perceive and understand the point of view of opponents in exactly the same context;
- fifth, to ensure verifiability of the presented evidence;

sixth, to know the logical rules of proof and disproof.

In fact, these rules are important not only for rejecting someone's point of view, but also for understanding the reasons why it is wrong. In the process of discussion, along with the above-mentioned rules, it is necessary to observe certain ethical norms that form the culture of discussion. These standards include being respectful and impartial to the viewpoints of others, being able to recognize the opponent's point of view as correct, being able to change one's own views under the influence of reasoned criticism, it requires having a sense of humor and so on.

However, in the field of science, there are also cases of conducting debates for non-scientific purposes. For example, the desire to show off one's intelligence, to enjoy mind games, to prove one's right by rejecting the opponent's position in any way possible. If such reasons are used as the basis of a scientific debate, then the debate is often ineffective.

There are several functions of the scientific debate, which characterize the debate as a process method that develops gradually, albeit in a complex, contradictory, but progressive way, through the collective activity of finding out the truth.

They consist of:

- generative function (promoting different points of view on the studied problems);

- selective function (selecting promising or more reliable points of view);

- integrative function (synthesis of positive elements of the discussed points of view and research directions related to them);

- correction function (identifying and correcting the expressed thoughts, concepts and arguments);

- constitutive function (deciding whether to accept or reject the discussed ideas).

When it comes to scientific debates, it is necessary to remember that it is necessary to be able to conduct the debate logically. For this, a high culture of debate is required. The following important aspects can be distinguished:

- the need to be able to ask the question correctly and clearly define the topic of the debate;

- the need to be able to understand the essence of the opponent's point of view, not only to be able to express one's position in a reasonable way, but also to know how to listen, to have the ability to hear opponents.

"D. I. Mendeleev made a very appropriate comment about these aspects of the scientific debate: Always know how to pay attention to the point of view of the opposing side, this is true wisdom." [Mendeleev D.I., 1995. S 411.].

In order for the discussion to be effective, the participants do not take too much time and energy, and do not get into a dead end, it is necessary to agree on the main concepts and categories used in the discussion at the beginning of the process, that is, to give them a strict and clear "working" meaning. necessary, these actions will help to clearly define the subject of the dispute. In order for the discussion to be effective, the participants do not take too much time and energy, and do not get into a dead end, it is necessary to agree on the main concepts and categories used in the discussion at the beginning of the process, that is, to give them a strict and clear "working" meaning. necessary, these actions will help to clearly define the subject of the dispute. Also, criticizing one's opponents in the course of debates must meet all the requirements and rules of serious, strict, objective and formal logic, in particular, the logical bases of thinking, evidence and rules.

A culture of debate requires adherence to standards of conduct, as criticism must be impartial and objective. At the same time, one should respect one's opponents and strive for mutual respect.

Psychological factors also play an important role in conducting scientific discussions. In particular, the desire to strengthen one's authority and position should not be hidden behind the initial passions on the way to the truth. In other words, it is necessary to take advantage of the convenience of critical discussion of the problem together and not allow its negative quality to appear.

In particular, it is necessary to prevent emotional injury of the participants due to emotional attachment in the debate, as a result of which mutual mistrust and even enmity should arise between them. As D. Bohm pointed out, "the main idea of dialogue is to be able to enter into a dialogue by keeping one's personal opinion in oneself, without imposing it on others, without pressure, and through mutual understanding." [Bom D. 1994., 217 p].

RESULTS

In collaborative thinking, each participant brings out his own idea, individual ideas are combined and become common, and as a result, it turns out that one person is thinking. All of this can only happen when the mindless egocentrism that blocks the path to trusting communication is eliminated. Knowing how to use them with this understanding will be especially useful in the analysis of socio-political events. At the moment, advanced information technology, the Internet, and computer networks are becoming popular, and millions of people are participating in debates. This opened wide perspectives for specialists in the field of philosophical sciences. Politicians, economists, artists, scientists, philosophers and other representatives of the field conduct public discussions, polemics and debates using advanced technologies. This rational creative synthesis of the debate can be carried out in a trans-dialogue space - in a communicative situation organized with the participation of virtual discussants and a real moderator of the scientific debate. In this case, the moderator (organizer) will have the opportunity to involve the participants, who are distinguished by the time interval and different fields of science, in the dialogue that he has determined. This type of modern dialogue provides new approaches to solving scientific problems. In order to successfully organize such a transdialogue, certain conditions must be met. To implement it, Y. M. Lotman [Lotman Y.M. 2014., 206 p] developed the following rules: in traditional communication: first, a need for dialogue must have arisen (this need is expressed in correspondence of the participants' mutual interest in communication);

- secondly, the positional language of the participants, which is common but has certain differences, should be used in communication (if there is no such difference, communication will be meaningless, but communication with absolute difference will be impossible);
- thirdly, the direction of messages in communication should be alternate (participants of the conversation should alternately switch from the "sending" position to the "receiving" position).

In the case of Transdialog, these conditions are changed as follows:

- firstly, the need to create a communication situation is directly derived from several scientific problems;
- secondly, the choice of the general language of the transdialog is chosen by the moderator based on the specifics of the problem;
- thirdly, the moderator organizes an alternative exchange of ideas of the transdialogue participants in his mental space, but remains an impartial, very objective and highly ethical listener of the ongoing discussion.

Scientific debate as a complex social and spiritual phenomenon is a rich and meaningful process. Researchers of this phenomenon usually focus on features that allow to determine the mechanism of the argument. Its mechanism includes the following components:

- determining the causes of disagreements, grouping the opinions of the disputing parties (partners);
- determining the level of differences in views, analyzing the causes of wrong positions, developing a common constructive position and establishing the truth.

A number of general rules should be observed in order for the debate to become a method of in-depth study of the discussed issues, an advanced way of thinking. It is necessary to pay attention to the following:

- not avoiding alternative viewpoints;

- to be able to see the object in the unity of opposites;

- to keep in mind that the opinions put forward are incomplete and relative in nature;

- to try to preserve the existing truth in them without mindlessly destroying all the arguments of the opponent.

DISCUSSION

The main task of the debate is to search for the truth through the struggle of opinions, the clash of opposing views, the identification and elimination of errors, and the establishment of mutual consensus. It is precisely for this reason that the debate is valuable for theory and practice. Only for this purpose it is useful. But in the history of science, there are many examples of how ideological and political factors strongly influenced the logical content and effectiveness of debates. It is necessary to pay special attention to their moral aspect. It is these factors and guidelines that lead to the emergence of the so-called "devilism" in science, the collapse of scientific schools and traditions, the moral depression of young people working in the field of science and led to deception and tragic destruction of the fate of real scientists.

Historical reality has once again proved that the flourishing of irrationalism, denial of scientific understanding of the world, neglect of moral values can lead to dangerous social consequences.

K. Popper rightly emphasized that "the individuality and diversity of thoughts, goals and tasks must be preserved for the continuation of mental development and the survival of the mind." As the history of science shows, fortunately, the scientific community has a kind of immunity in the form of a fight against false scientific concepts, in exchange for positive socio-cultural conditions, such false scientific concepts are criticized and rejected.

Thus, among the philosophical problems of the theory of argumentation, the research of the integration of debate as a means of communication in the system of science and socio-political life shows the relevance of a new view of the logical-epistemological status of the phenomenon of scientific debate.

REFERENCES

1. Panjiyev S. Haqiqat tushunchasining falsafiy mohiyati. //O‘zMU xabarlar, 2014. №1/4. – B. 129.
2. Пружинин Б. И. Наука как профессия и как феномен культуры// Вопросы философии. 2019, – № 8. – С. 5
3. Sharipov M. Dialektik mantiqda haqiqat va isbotlash masalasi/Alisher Navoiy va falsafa tarixining dolzarb muammolari. Ilmiy to‘plam.– T.: "Turon zamin ziyo", 2016. – B. 98.

4. Менделеев Д. И. Заветные мысли: полное издание. – М.: “Мысль”, 1995. – С. 411.
5. Бом Д. Наука и духовность: необходимость изменений в культуре//Логика: логические основы общения. Хрестоматия. – М.: “Наука”, 1994. – С. 217-218.
6. Лотман Ю. М. Механизмы диалога //Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. – СПб.: “Азбука”, 2014. – С. 206-219
7. Turabova, K. K., & Turabova, S. K. (2021). THE ROLE OF SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION IN THE FORMATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND CREATIVE ABILITIES AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS*, 2(06), 167-170.
8. Turabova, S. K. (2021). Socio-Historical and Logical-Epistemological foundations of the development of the art of dispute. *ASIAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL RESEARCH*, 10(5), 58-61.
9. Турабова, С. К. (2022). ИННОВАЦИОН ТАФАККУР—ЖАМИЯТНИНГ БАРҚАРОР РИВОЖЛАНИШ МЕЗОНИ. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(12), 424-429.
10. Turabova, S. K. (2019). Socio-historical basis for the development of euristics in the history of knowledge. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 3(71), 485-488.
11. Kattakulovna, T. S. (2020). The importance of the discussion method in the development of argumentative competence in students. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 2(09), 442-446.